

REMARKS

Remarks as it regards to the Office Action Date from November 16th, 2007.

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the

- 5 following remarks is respectfully requested.

Specification Remarks

Therefore, to provide a clear resolution, the Applicant has resubmitted the Amendments to the Specification as requested by the Examiner. The Applicant

- 10 would like to revert back to the original submission for the BIB DATA SHEET.

This was the intention of the last submission as requested by the Examiner.

Claim Remarks

The Examiner has rejected the Amendment on August 13th, 2007 under 37

- 15 U.S.C. §103(a).

The Examiner rejects Claim 1 and Claim 23 as unpatentable over Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) based on 37 U.S.C. §103(a).

- 20 The Examiner states that Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) [fig. 2, col.6, lines 38-46, col. 7 lines 1-25, col.10, lines 24-62 and col. 13, lines 44-50] states that the tethered device with wireless communication network to a street light (35)/ highway/ easy installable wireless network. Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) [col. 13, lines 44-50] clearly states on that the system for coupling a wireless signal to and from is a powerline communication system. The Applicant believes that Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) may not clearly state a wireless mesh network is solely used for the backbone for the communication network. Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) [col. 13, lines 44-50] states that the tethered device can create a wireless communication network to communicate with untethered devices.
- 25 However, the backbone is clearly a coupling system to a powerline communication network backbone and not a mesh wireless network backbone.
- 30

Therefore, since Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) requires powerline communication in the tethered device and teaches that the communication network backbone should be powerline communications. It could not be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) as prior art since this

- 5 Application is solely using wireless communication (Mesh network) as the network backbone in Claims 1 and Claim 23. Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894) (col. 13 lines 1-9) teaches of connecting through another device to the powerline network, but this is not a Mesh wireless network. This is a bridge wireless connection.

10 Furthermore, in my last office response on October, there is no reference to powerline communication network in Claim 1 or Claim 23. However, The Applicant has added the updated Claim1 and Claim 23 so as to clearly define the communication method over Mowery, Jr. (U.S. 6,492,894).

15 The Applicant also wants to point out that this is not new material and is specifically referenced in the original application. [Page 2 – Lines 20-25, Page 2 – Lines 31-35, Page 3 – Lines 16-22, Page 10 – Lines 17-28, Page 11 – Line 28-35, Page 15 – Lines 13-22, Claim 23, Claim 26]

20 In light of the amendments to the Applicant's Claim 1 and Claim 23, the Applicant believes that all Claims are now clearly defined over the references cited by the Examiner.

25 Accordingly, the Applicant believes the Application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

30 
Dr. Richard A. Mowery, Jr.

(254) 848-9932